

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on January 20, 2010. In this Amendment, claims 1, 21-23, 31, 34-35, 44-46, 51 and 52 are amended, claims 42, 59, 68 and 69 are canceled, and no claims are added, so that claims 1-9, 11, 13-27, 29-39, 41, 43-47, 49-56, 58-64 and 66-67 are pending and subject to examination. Support for the new claims can be found in the Application as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

I. Examiner Interview

On April 19, 2010, the undersigned Applicants' representative and Examiner Tran conducted a telephone interview. During the telephone interview, the Examiner's interpretations of the claims and the cited references were discussed as well as possible amendments to the claims that would overcome the rejections. Ultimately, an agreement was reached as to amendments to the claims that would overcome the rejections in the pending office action. The Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for his time and suggestions. The foregoing amended claims and the following remarks reflect the agreement reached during the interview.

II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-27, 29-39, 41, 43-47, 49-56, 58-64 and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Chiu et al.* (US 2007/051271) in view of *Coar* (US 2007/0106932). This rejection is traversed.

A. Independent Claims 1, 21, 34, 44, 51 and 61

Obviousness has not been established in regard to 1, 21, 34, 44, 51 and 61 since *Chiu et al.* and *Coar* fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation in the claims as amended. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *Chiu et al.* and *Coar* fail to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "a matching algorithm to compare the OCR determined text to the audio of the recorded information to determine a portion of the recorded information that matches the OCR determined

text,” as recited in the currently amended independent claims 1, 21, 34, 44, 51 and 61. Support for this feature is found in paragraphs [0089]-[0095] of the Application as originally filed. Because *Chiu et al.* and *Coar* fail to teach such a feature, obviousness is not established. As such, the amendments to the claims overcome the rejections under §103.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under §103 be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

B. Dependent Claims


The dependent claims in the Application are allowable by virtue of depending from allowable subject matter discussed above and include additional patentable subject matter. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims under §103 be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Knittel
Reg. No. 55,333

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
M3K:asb
62438695 v1